



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

their nature, or any transubstantiation of them into His body and blood; any more than when He calls His natural body wheat and bread, or when He calls Himself a vine, there is any change of His nature, or any transubstantiation of Himself into wheat, or bread, or a vine.

The point which Theodoret thus brings out is well worth attending to. It is true that our Lord has called bread by the name of His body, but it is also true that He calls His natural body by the name of wheat and bread. It is true that He calls wine His blood, but it is also true that He calls Himself a vine. Why are these two classes of passages to be understood differently? and why is an unbending literal interpretation to be given to one set of passages which nobody dreams of giving to the other?

In the following passage Theodoret draws from the *Eucharist* a proof of the truth of our Lord's body, and the reality of His human nature still existing:—

"Orth.—The mystical symbols offered to God by the priests, pray tell me what are they signs of?

"Eran.—Of the Lord's body and blood.

"Orth.—Of His body, truly or not truly such?

"Eran.—Of that which is truly so.

"Orth.—Very right. For there must be an original of an image; for painters imitate nature, and draw the images of visible things.

"Eran.—True.

"Orth.—If, then, the divine mysteries are antitypes of a true body, then the Lord's body is a true body still, not changed into the nature of the Deity, but filled with divine glory."

In other words, Theodoret argues, that since the Eucharist is the sign of the Lord's body, and that since to every sign must correspond something signified; therefore our Lord must still have a true body; and, therefore, that it must be false to assert that His ascended body has been changed into the nature of Deity; whereas, in truth, His body, although filled with divine glory, retains the truth of a human body. It is obvious that if the writer had believed in transubstantiation, we would have had a much shorter argument; he would have said the Lord has a true body since the Eucharist is daily converted into the true body of our Lord.

We resume our quotation. The Eutychian says that since mention has been made of the Eucharist, he will thence draw an argument in support of his views:—

"Eran.—As the symbols of Christ's body and blood are one thing before the priest's invocation, but after the invocation are changed, and become another thing; so the Lord's body, after His assumption, is changed into a divine essence.

"Orth.—You are caught in a net of your own weaving; for, after sanctification the mystical symbols do not depart from their own nature; for they remain still in their former substance, and figure, and form, and may be seen and touched just as before; but they are understood to be that which they are made, and are believed and venerated as being those things they are believed to be."

And Pope Gelasius, likewise arguing also against the same class of heretics, repeats the same argument.

"The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we take are surely a divine thing, for which reason we become by them partakers of the divine nature, and yet the substance of the bread and wine does not cease to be; and, indeed, the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries," &c.

In all these passages a principle is taken for granted, directly the contrary of the doctrine taught now by the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome now teaches that the substance of the bread and wine is annihilated. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Gelasius teach that the substance of the bread and wine remains. And the strength of this proof is increased by the fact that these statements occur, not in a direct treatise on the Eucharist, but in an argument on a wholly different subject. For we must believe that these principles by which they endeavoured to confute their opponents were truths acknowledged by all parties; unless we are to suppose these great fathers to have been so destitute of common sense as to attempt to prove *incertum per incertius*, and to put into the hands of their adversaries a weapon which could be retorted with fatal effect. For, suppose that transubstantiation had been in those days the doctrine of the Church, how triumphantly could the Eutychian have retorted on his orthodox adversaries. We would say: "You have brought forward the Eucharist to illustrate the two-fold nature of our Lord. I accept your illustration and turn it against yourselves. For the Church holds that in the Eucharist the nature of bread and wine does not remain; it possesses not a two-fold nature, but one wholly divine; and so likewise is our Lord's human nature wholly absorbed in the divinity which remains now His only nature."

This reply is so obvious and conclusive that it is evident that the orthodox champions were not prepared for the possibility of it; that they did not think it possible for any one to assert that it was the doctrine of the Church that in the Eucharist the nature of bread and wine do not remain.

Roman Catholic divines are sadly puzzled what to say in reply to the evidence afforded by this Eutychian controversy that the Church of that day did not believe in

transubstantiation, and they have nothing better to say in reply than that when these fathers say that the nature or substance of bread remains, they mean nothing more than that the accidents of bread remain. We scarcely think that a reply is necessary to this gratuitous assertion, that substance means accidents. We challenge them to produce the smallest proof that any of these fathers had heard of the fancy of the schoolmen, that accidents could be separated from their substance, and exist without it, or that the accidents could remain, and the substance not remain. And if they meant to assert that the accidents only remained, the Eutychian retort remained in full force; for the Eutychian might admit that our Lord's body, in like manner, exhibited the outward appearance of human nature, though, in reality, the humanity had been wholly absorbed by the divinity.

We have demonstrated, we think, that the champions of the orthodox against the Eutychian heretics, in the fifth century, did not hold the doctrine of transubstantiation. There remains the minor question, are we to reckon St. Chrysostom among the number of those whose opinions on the Eucharist were elicited by a similar controversy, and was he really the author of the epistle to Cæsarius. We can afford to state the evidence on this subject with perfect candour and impartiality; for, as far as the evidence in proof of the novelty of transubstantiation is concerned, it is immaterial to us whether St. Chrysostom be the author or not. It is certain that this epistle to Cæsarius is the work of a champion of the orthodox faith in opposition to heretics. The arguments he puts forward, and the principles which he takes for granted, must be those which were held by the Church of his age. The fact that this epistle was ascribed to St. Chrysostom, and generally believed to be his, proves that nothing was found in the epistle opposed to the received faith of the Church, or such as an esteemed divine, such as St. Chrysostom, would be regarded as incapable of having written. And as the value of the epistle to us is not the light which it throws upon the private opinions of St. Chrysostom (which would be a matter of mere curiosity), but the light which it throws upon the received doctrine of the Church of his day, it renders us this service, whether he were actually the author or not.

And supposing even that it were to turn out that the epistle did not belong to the age of St. Chrysostom at all, but that it was written a hundred years later; why, this would be all the better for us. It is a curious thing that it is always a Roman Catholic's interest to produce fathers on his side as old as he can, while it is the interest of Protestants to produce the most modern fathers they can find on their side. The reason of this is, that we maintain that the peculiar doctrines of Romanism are innovations, added to the original pure and apostolic doctrine. It is evident that the older books that Roman Catholics can find containing their doctrines, the better they defend themselves against the charge of innovation. On the other hand, the more modern books Protestants can find ignoring any Roman Catholic doctrine, or opposed to it, the later it proves to have been the introduction of these additions to the ancient pure faith. Thus in the present example: if the epistle to Cæsarius were written by St. Chrysostom, it proves that transubstantiation had not become the faith of the Church at the beginning of the fifth century. Supposing it was proved that this epistle was written a hundred years later, why this would be a hundred years clear gain to us; it would prove that for a hundred years after Chrysostom the notion of transubstantiation was still unheard of.

Feeling ourselves, then, quite indifferent, and having no prejudice on either side of the question, we shall state as fairly as we can the arguments on both sides of the question whether this epistle is St. Chrysostom's or not. And, in the first place, there is all the evidence in favour of this epistle being St. Chrysostom's which exists in favour of most of his minor works. The epistle bears the title, "The Epistle of the blessed John, Bishop of Constantinople, to the Monk Cæsarius, in the time of his second exile." It is quoted as Chrysostom's by St. John of Damascus, by the Presbyter Anastasius, by Nicephorus, and others, who wrote on the subject of the two natures of our Lord. It is plain that such evidence ought not to be rejected without strong evidence on the other side; and, accordingly, the Jesuit Hardonin, in his discussion of this epistle, accepts it as a genuine work of St. Chrysostom's; and no one appears to have denied its genuineness until Lequien assailed it in his dissertation prefixed to the works of St. Joannes Damascenus. We think it is pretty certain that the work would have been allowed to remain quietly St. Chrysostom's if it had not been for the disagreeable doctrine which is taught in it. Some of the arguments adduced by the Benedictine editor for rejecting it are very trifling. He feels a difficulty because we do not hear elsewhere of the monk Cæsarius, just as if all St. Chrysostom's correspondents must be as celebrated as himself; and he finds the style very unlike that of other works of St. Chrysostom. But the argument from difference of style, which is at all times precarious, is in this case particularly so, as the great part of the epistle is only preserved in a Latin translation. What would have real force in making us doubt the genuineness of the epistle would be, if the assertion could be proved that the language of the epistle shows an acquaintance

with phraseology which was not used until the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies which arose after the death of St. Chrysostom. If this were so, the presumption would be that the epistle was forged some 50 years after his death by some of the orthodox opponents of the Eutychians, who wished to press these heretics down with the weight of St. Chrysostom's authority; that as they could not represent that father writing against the Eutychians by name, they represent him as writing against the Apollinarians, and using against them arguments directly applicable to the Eutychians also. If this were so, the testimony, as we have said, in proof of the doctrine of the Church of the fifth century would be as strong as before. A forger would be even more cautious than St. Chrysostom himself not to use language inconsistent with his known opinions. And an epistle written by the champions of orthodoxy in the name of St. Chrysostom, and so successfully imitating that writer as to deceive every one down to the time of Father Lequien, could not possibly contain any doctrinal statement opposed to the orthodox faith of the Church of his day, which St. Chrysostom was known to have strenuously maintained.

But the Benedictine editor himself does his best to remove much of the ground of suspicion against this epistle. He shows that by whomsoever it was written, it was directed against Apollinarians, not Eutychians; that the errors which it opposes are expressed in the very words which we know from other sources to have been used by Apollinarius; and that no doctrine is controverted in this epistle except what we can prove the Apollinarians maintained. This being so, we think it very unlikely that a forger would have executed his task so successfully as to be guilty of no anachronism in this matter; and we see no reason for rejecting the old tradition which ascribes the work to St. Chrysostom. But however this may be, it is sufficient for our purpose to have shown that the champions of orthodoxy in the fifth century defended the truth of our Lord's two natures by denying in express words the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.

THE SEE OF ST. PETER.—No. VIII.

WE undertook in our April number to notice some alleged Scripture testimonies relied on by our correspondent, Dr. Geraghty, as evidence of St. Peter's supremacy. They were Matt. x. 2, Acts i., and Acts xv. 12.* Let us now see what their evidence amounts to, and what they are really worth.

The first is, we believe, a favourite argument with Roman Catholics, judging from the frequency with which it has been repeated by various writers; but it appears to us to prove nothing whatsoever. St. Matthew is recording our Lord's calling to Him His twelve disciples, and he enumerates their names, placing Peter first in the catalogue; but so far is the Evangelist from stating or insinuating that in naming him first he meant that he was to have greater powers than the rest, that the context appears to negative any such inference, for our blessed Lord is represented as bestowing on all His twelve disciples the same powers. "And having called His twelve disciples together, he gave them power over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of diseases and all manner of infirmities. And the names of the twelve Apostles are these, the first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, &c. These twelve Jesus sent, commanding them to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and going, to preach, saying the kingdom of heaven is at hand." We believe it was a common opinion of the Fathers that St. Peter was the first called of the Apostles, some that he had precedence in point of age, others of personal merit; but whatever the ground may be on which he was named first in this catalogue, it at most can denote a mere precedence of honour, not a supremacy in power or authority over the rest. Surely, it is unnecessary to go into any argument to prove that it is a mere fallacy to contend that a primacy or precedence cannot exist among equals in rank without conferring power over the rest in him who has the precedence, much less such a supreme and absolute power as the advocates of the Papal supremacy are driven to contend for.

It may be worth while, however, to observe that St. Peter is not always named first in the Scriptures, though he generally may be so. See, for example, St. John i. 44, in which Bethsaida is called, not the city of Peter and Andrew, but of Andrew and Peter. If St. John the Evangelist really considered St. Peter a monarch, and Andrew his subject, is it not strange that he should have so placed them? If Andrew had been named first, or as first in St. Matthew, would Dr. Geraghty think it any proof that Andrew had the supremacy over his brother Peter?

Again, St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, speaking of his going up with Barnabas and Titus to the Apostles at Jerusalem, places Cephas (i.e., Peter) after James, ch. ii., v. 9: "James, and Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles, and they unto the uncircumcision." If St. Paul had considered Peter as having supreme or any power over James and John, is it possible that he should not only call them all by the same title—"pillars," but place James before Peter? If he had

* See p. 45, supra CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. VII.

said Peter, and James, and John, who seemed to be pillars, it would have been deemed a strong argument in favour of Peter's supremacy: why, then, when St. Paul places James before Peter, is it not equally an argument for James's supremacy? That, however, St. Paul was wholly ignorant of any such doctrine as the headship or supremacy of St. Peter is evident from what immediately follows, v. 11, &c. We quote, as is our custom, from the Douay Bible—"But when Cephas (Peter) was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that some came from James he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas, before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We by nature are Jews, and not of the Gentiles sinners. But knowing that man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, we also believe in Christ Jesus," &c. Here, then, we have St. Paul teaching and reproving the supreme pastor, because "he walked not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel." Can any candid man who reads this whole passage believe that St. Paul, when he wrote it, considered St. Peter not only as a "pillar" of Christ's Church, but as its living supreme ruler and teacher. Let us just weigh the force of this statement by what would have been attributed to it by the advocates of Roman supremacy, if it had been St. Peter that had written and spoken thus of St. Paul, and we shall be able to form a better estimate of its value in the opposite scale of the argument against that supremacy.

The next passage relied on is the narrative in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, of the calling or election of Matthias as an apostle in place of Judas Iscariot.

The inspired historian tells us that after our Lord's ascension into heaven from Mount Olivet, His disciples returned to Jerusalem, and were collected together, to the number of about one hundred and twenty, in an upper room in which the eleven abode.

St. Peter, if ever he was acknowledged the divinely instituted supreme head of the Church, must, we suppose, have been so then, when the whole of our Lord's Apostles were collected in one room upon so important an occasion. And if St. Peter was ever to commence acting as Christ's vicar or vicegerent upon earth, it was surely at that moment when our blessed Lord had just finished His divine personal mission on earth, and had visibly ascended into heaven. The occasion also was a solemn one; for the assembled Church was about to witness the first exercise of ecclesiastical and apostolical authority, in the selection and appointment of a successor to the ministry and apostleship, from which "Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place."

If we had not been familiar with the divine record of the Acts of the Apostles, when we found so learned and acute a man as Dr. Geraghty relying confidently on 1st Acts as a proof of St. Peter's supremacy, we should have expected to find that St. Peter took this occasion to show his supreme power by at once naming and appointing the successor to the fallen apostle of his own authority.

But how are the facts as recorded in this chapter?

St. Peter, indeed, proposed that one of those who had been associated with them during the whole time of our Lord's ministry should be selected, in place of Judas, as a joint witness with them of His resurrection, and reminded them that it was written in the book of Psalms, "And his bishopric let another take." Whereupon the disciples present, whether the eleven Apostles only, or the whole assembled 120, is not expressly stated (though we think it was the latter, as we shall presently show), at once proceeded to select two; and after praying solemnly to the Lord to show which of the two He had chosen, they gave them lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven Apostles. Everything that was done was done not by Peter alone, but by them all. "They appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And, praying, they said: Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen to take the place of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas hath by transgression fallen, that he might go to his own place. And they gave them lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven Apostles."—1 Acts, 23-26.

Judging from the mode of popular election of Bishops in primitive times, as well as from the general terms in which the sacred writer speaks of the brethren, we can have little doubt that all present (the 120) took part in the appointment. The persons addressed by St. Peter were the whole assembly. "Peter, rising up in the midst of the brethren (the number was about 120) addressed them all: Men and brethren, the Scripture must needs be fulfilled," &c.—v. 15, 16. And they (i.e., those whom Peter had just addressed) appointed two, and they (that is, still the same persons) gave their lots, &c.

St. Peter, therefore, was merely the leader or spokesman who, proposing a step which recommended itself to the brethren assembled, as both reasonable and scriptural,

they all unanimously adopted and acted on the proposal. If, indeed, St. Peter had proceeded to tell them that by reason of our Lord's appointment he, Peter, was the rock on which the Church was built, and the chief shepherd to whom Christ had committed the charge of both shepherds and flock, and that it, therefore, became his duty to provide a successor to the fallen Judas, and he had thereupon proceeded to appoint Barsabas and Matthias, and to give them lots, and the assembled Apostles and brethren had thereupon acquiesced in such claim and exercise of spiritual authority and pre-eminence, the narrative would, doubtless, have afforded no inconsiderable proof that the assembled Church and Apostles recognized Peter as supreme; but in the absence of all this, and the very contrary being recorded, we confess we consider the passage as making strongly against, and not in favour, of that supremacy which Dr. G. contends for.

Let us now see whether the remaining passage from Acts xv. is more favourable.

Certain Judaizing teachers professing to be Christians having insisted on their brethren submitting to the law of Moses, saying, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved," Paul and Barnabas, and some others, were sent to Jerusalem to the Apostles and elders (Douay Bible—priests) about this question. And when they were come to Jerusalem, the Apostles and ancients (elders) came together to consider the matter. There was much disputing; certain of the sect of the Pharisees that believed saying that they must be circumcised, and be commanded to obey the law of Moses. Well, St. Peter was present; and was the dispute settled by his authority? or how was it settled? St. Peter, indeed, took a part in the debate, and brought forward some strong reasons why the decision of the Apostles and elders "who were assembled to consider the matter," should be against these Judaizers. But so far from his suggestions having been at once acquiesced in as a decision of the matter, by the assembly crying out "Peter has spoken, the cause is finished," as Father Newman and others would have us believe to be the law of the Church with respect to Peter's alleged successor Pope Pius IX., and the whole assembly put at once to silence, as Dr. Geraghty would have us believe; the discussion went on, and if the assembly held their peace it was only because they were eager to listen to what Barnabas and Paul had to tell them of the great signs and wonders which God had wrought among the Gentiles by them. So far, however, was the matter even then from being decided, that after they held their peace, St. James addressed them at length, "Men and brethren, hearken unto me, &c. Whereupon my sentence is (or 'for which cause I judge.'—Douay Bible) that we trouble not the Gentiles who are converted to God, but that we write unto them that they refrain from idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood." And this judgment or sentence of St. James was exactly what was adopted by the assembly, which may, perhaps, be considered the first Council ever held by the Church. "Then it pleased the Apostles and ancients, with the whole Church, to choose men of their own company, and to send to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, namely Judas and Silas, chief men among the brethren, writing by their hands: The Apostles and ancient brethren, to the brethren that are at Antioch and in Syria and Cilicia, greeting. Forasmuch as we have heard that some going out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, to whom we gave no commandment, it hath seemed good to us, being assembled together, to choose out men, and to send them unto you with our well-beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have given their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent, therefore, Judas and Silas, who themselves also will by word of mouth tell you the same things. For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burthen upon you than these necessary things; that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which things keeping yourselves you shall do well. Fare ye well. They, therefore, being dismissed went down to Antioch, and gathering together the multitude delivered the epistle."—(Douay Bible, Acts xv., 22-30.)

So far, therefore, is this from being a sentence of St. Peter ex cathedra, yielded to in silence at once by the assembled Church, that those assembled listened to Paul and Barnabas and James, after Peter had spoken, and it was not even at the instance or suggestion of Peter that the Apostles and elders decided on sending this epistle, but on St. James's, who, in fact, dictated the very terms of it. The epistle, however, and the decision it announced was neither St. James's nor St. Peter's, but that of the whole body of the Apostles and elders—"Then it pleased the Apostles and ancients, with the whole Church."

How unlike all this is to a sentence of St. Peter exercising a supreme and infallible authority, we need scarcely observe. And yet Dr. Geraghty, in his letter of April, p. 45, does not hesitate to refer to it as a proof of the supremacy, as if it was the plainest thing in the world, not requiring or admitting of any argument. "Again," writes Dr. G.: "in Acts xv., when all the multitude were silenced (v. 12), after his speech, which was the first!" But the cause of their silence makes all the difference. If it had been "Peter has spoken, the cause is finished," it would have been much. But that it was not so is too plain to require argument. They heard Paul and Barnabas and James before they de-

cided the matter, and if they were more influenced by any one of the speakers than by the others it would appear to have been by St. James; for they waited for no other, but adopted his sentence unanimously, and to the very letter. Why did they not consider the matter ended when St. Peter gave his opinion? How could St. James have presumed to call for a hearing, as if further argument was necessary, if he knew that Peter was the divinely appointed head of the Church, with a supreme power, which was to be handed down to his successors to the end of time, as Christ's vicar and vicegerent on earth? If we wanted a conclusive proof that St. Peter was not so considered in this first Council of Jerusalem by the whole assembled body of the Apostles, we think we could not desire or expect a better; and yet it is coolly relied on by Dr. Geraghty as a Scripture testimony to St. Peter's supremacy! Is it not clear that the advocates of Rome have learned to reason in a peculiar school, which can see only just so much as seems to favour their predetermined conclusions, and that they ignore every argument and difficulty which they are unable to answer. We think it required some boldness to rely on any of the passages we have been commenting on as proofs of the supremacy; and, we confess, we should like to see either some attempt at an excuse for resorting to such arguments, or some feeling, at least, of shame evinced, when their fallacy is exposed.

ECCELESIASTICAL MIRACLES—No. II.

In our April number we made some remarks on Dr. Newman's Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles. We stated the arguments by which he endeavours to prove the continued existence of miraculous powers in the Church; and we also referred to the complete refutation of those arguments which he had himself given by anticipation in a former Essay on the Miracles of Scripture. Our limits precluded us from remarking on any of the alleged ecclesiastical miracles which Dr. Newman adduces, and the evidence for which he undertakes to examine. As, however, the subject would be incomplete without giving some specimens of this class of miracles, we propose on the present occasion to notice a few of the miracles said to have been performed by English Saints. We take our account of them from a work entitled *Lives of the English Saints*, published under the editorship of Dr. Newman subsequently to his "Essay," and which, therefore, may fairly be regarded as a commentary upon its principles. Let us begin then with the miracle of

ST. GERMAN AND THE COCK.

This miracle is recorded in the ninth volume of the *Lives of the English Saints*, and runs as follows:—

"During the same journey he (St. German) retired one evening to the dwelling of some persons of humble condition. Though he could command the attentions of the wealthy and great, yet, he often avoided them, and frequented the lower ranks of life. While he was thus lodged, he passed the whole night in prayer, as was his practice after our Lord's example. Daylight broke in, and to his surprise the cock failed to herald in the morning. He asked the reason, and learned that an obstinate taciturnity had succeeded to the usual cry. Pleased at finding an opportunity of rewarding his hosts, German took some wheat, blessed it, and gave it to some of the birds to eat, whereby he restored their natural faculties. A deed of this kind, which might have been forgotten by the rich, was likely to remain fixed in the memory of the poor. [Hence, of course, the evidence for its truth.] The appreciation of any action depends generally on the degree of utility which it conveys to different people, and circumstances which appear trivial to some are important to others. Thus could our Lord adapt His wonderful signs to the wants of men, at one time turning water into wine, at another multiplying the loaves, at another taking a fish for a piece of money which it contained."—St. German, p. 89.

Our Roman Catholic readers will please to remark the reverential comparison instituted, in the last sentence, between the miracles of our blessed Lord and that of St. German in restoring their voice to the dumb cocks.

Dr. Newman observes in his Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles (p. xxv.): "The miracles of Scripture are definite and whole transactions, drawn out and carried through from first to last, with beginning and ending, clear, complete, and compact in the narrative, separated from extraneous matter, and consigned to authentic statements. Whereas, the ecclesiastical miracles, for the most part, are not contained in any authenticated form or original document; at least, they need to be extracted from merely historical works, and often are only floating rumours, popular traditions, vague, various, inconsistent in detail, tales which only appear to have survived, . . . recorded at a distance from the time and country when and where they profess to have occurred."

A striking illustration of this candid description of ecclesiastical miracles is furnished by

THE MIRACULOUS FOOTSTEPS IN THE ROCK.

These marvellous footprints were once, we are told, to be seen in the island of Jersey; but, unfortunately, they are not there now. This, however, is of little consequence

a This work has been ably criticised by the Rev. J. C. Crosthwaite, in a valuable and interesting book, entitled, "Modern Hagiology," London, J. W. Parker, 1846; to which we are mainly indebted for the matter of the present article.